

# W.E.B. Du Bois and the Paradox of American Democracy : A Battle for World Peace

HONDA Kazuhisa

## 1. Du Bois as an Activist Scholar for World Peace

W.E.B. Du Bois (1868 to 1963), an African American sociologist and activist for world peace, tried to sociologically explain the complex structure of the white dominant world order by referring to racial hierarchies constructed by white countries, especially the United States, and their colonial expansion into colored nations for capitalistic exploitation of cheap labor and natural resources through military aggression. His sociological analysis of a white dominant world order seems quite similar to a perspective of world system theory on asymmetrical international relations of the center and the periphery<sup>1</sup>. Such a perspective urged him to strenuously struggle for the abolishment of white racist and colonial domination over colored nations, and thereby to continuously appeal for world peace until he left the United States for Ghana eternally in 1961<sup>2</sup>.

Du Bois's strategy as an activist scholar for world peace and racial equality was to reveal to the U.S. citizens and the international community the several contradictions inherent in American democracy, such as racial discrimination, warmongering propaganda by the U.S. government and big business, and the suppression of democratic rights like freedoms of thought and speech. Du Bois executed this strategy just as the U.S. government was appealing for world peace and democracy throughout the world. This is why Du Bois was often regarded as "subversive," "unpatriotic," and "un-American," and was politically and socially intimidated in the United States.

This paper will firstly explore Du Bois's understanding of a white dominant world order from a sociological perspective, and will then show Du Bois's tireless domestic and international struggle to encourage world peace vis-à-vis the warmongering U.S. government during the Cold War. Finally, to conclude, this paper will analyze the effectiveness of Du Bois's struggle for world peace in the geopolitical context of global anti-racist and independence movements for self-determination throughout Asian and African nations after World War II.

## 2. Du Bois's Analysis of the World Order

While Du Bois's sociological works are widely read in American academia, sociologists in Japan have ignored his important role in the history of American sociology<sup>3</sup>. They typically introduce American sociology by mainly referring to Talcott Parsons's theory of the social system. However, Du Bois's academic works deeply explain the divisions in American society on a wide range of issues including racism and war during the 20th century. Further, Du Bois does so in a way that is more accurate than the social system theory, which assumes a static perspective to assert that American society is highly integrated based upon American democratic ideals and norms (Parsons 1977), as some sociologists critically outline the limitations of Parsons's sociological theory (Takagi 1988: 208-209).

Du Bois's academic interests ranged widely, and included topics such as racism, capitalistic exploitation, and colonialism. Du Bois attempted to clarify from a Marxist perspective<sup>4</sup> how these issues closely interconnected in that they all resulted in military conflicts throughout the world and constructed the structure of the white dominant world order. Du Bois surely understood that the United States and European colonial powers aggressively competed for the cheap labor of colored people, natural resources, and political ambitions all over the world. Then, based on his academic works, Du Bois continued actively struggling for human liberation and peace throughout the world, even when faced with the risk of harsh threats after World War I. As Edward J. Blum points out that Du Bois's hatred against war and commitment to world peace "held new force in *Darkwater*," which was "published following the deaths of millions during World War I" (2007: 29), Du Bois wrote, "I believe in the Prince of Peace. I believe that War is Murder" (1920: 1).

Through his political activism, Du Bois was consistently seeking to reveal to the global community (including U.S. citizens) that the United States was not democratic but hypocritical in its own practices, both domestic and international. In addition, Du Bois criticized unjust American democracy for its rationalization of worldwide militaristic aggression, including two world wars, the Cold War, and the Korean War. Du Bois himself led peace groups such as the Peace Information Center, and organized international conferences for the promotion of world peace. As a result of his efforts, he was frequently threatened under the political pressures throughout his life, especially during the age of McCarthyism and the Red Scare. In 1951, he was even indicted for advancing peace appeals in cooperation with international organizations such as the Defenders of Peace in Paris, which the U.S. government insisted was in violation of the Foreign Agent Registration Act of 1938.

Though it is possible to interpret Du Bois as a patriot who appealed for the promotion of American democracy and the improvement of living conditions of all Americans,

irrespective of the color of skin or class (Chiba 2003: 182-3), he was very often regarded as “un-American” because he always tried to expose the hypocrisy and contradictions of American democracy. In addition, as Du Bois sympathized with communist ideals of social equity during the age of the Cold War, his academic works and political activities were harshly criticized. His work was often viewed as supporting the political and diplomatic interests of the Soviet Union and its allies to promote their anti-U.S. propaganda and to threaten the national interests of the United States<sup>5</sup>.

### 3. American Democracy and the White Dominant World Order

Du Bois himself was always confronted with and sought to find the best approaches to overcome the racially unequal structure in the United States. However, his concern was not limited to the domestic affairs of unjust American democracy. Rather, he understood racism as a global phenomenon as well. Thus, Du Bois organized Pan-African conferences several times and appealed for the solidarity of colored people in colonized nations all over the world who were deprived of their rights to self-determination and were exposed to the political and economic ambitions of white nations including the United States. These nations faced great struggle despite the establishment of the League of Nations and the United Nations whose main goals were to solve international conflicts among white nations competing for more colonial territories after the first and second world wars. Du Bois’s critical thinking for world peace and democracy reflects his famous declaration at the first Pan-African conference in London in 1900 that “the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line” (1903: xxxi)<sup>6</sup>.

#### 3.1. Racist ideology

Du Bois seemed to believe that modern racist ideology is the most important basis upon which white people legitimized and constructed their political, economic, and cultural power structure worldwide. According to Du Bois, white conservatives believed in their racial superiority vis-à-vis colored people, and thus justified their imperialistic invasion into African and Asian nations.

Racist ideology cannot be separated from the historical background of the 19th and 20th centuries in which the advancement of modern natural sciences contributed to construct white people’s “objective” understanding of not just the natural world but also society, culture, and human nature based upon physical characteristics such as skin color. Following Darwin’s law of evolution along with other biological, medical, and genetic discoveries scientifically proving the progress of species from simple types to more complex and superior ones, social Darwinism developed under this historical context. Social Darwinism influenced the development of social sciences that explained the evolution from primitive communities with “inferior” races to a more civilized, modern society

made up of white people. According to Du Bois, around 1900, pseudo-scientific eugenics played an important role in promoting racist discourse of white supremacy and claimed to prove the racial “inferiority” of colored people by mentioning “scientific” evidence such as brain volume (1946: 37) and IQ (1915: 237).

While ignoring the history of slavery and the poor living conditions of colored people, which Du Bois claimed inevitably contributed to their racial “inferiority,” those who believed in white supremacy stigmatized non-white people as “irrational,” “un-civil,” “lazy,” “passive,” and “ignorant” by nature (Du Bois 1945: 25). Are these negative characterizations of colored people not simply false? Ironically, their economic and social realities of poverty, poor working skills, lack of education, and high rates of divorce and crime in black communities, as Du Bois described in his study of “Negro problems” in Philadelphia (1899), proved the racial “inferiority” of African Americans. While dominant whites naturally believed in racist ideology, colored people internalized its legitimacy into their psyches and voluntarily obeyed the power structure of the racial hierarchies, thereby destroying their aspirations for the improvement of their economic and political status and even strengthening the racist structure.

Based upon the doctrine of white supremacy, paternalistic white countries justified colonialism and slavery by asserting that colored people are unfit for independence and self-determination (Du Bois 1945: 25), and white countries should thus dominate colored people and guide them to civilization and progress as their “guardians.” According to Du Bois, “the South continually insists that a benevolent guardianship of whites over blacks is the ideal thing” (1920: 85).

### 3.2. Exploitation of Colored Nations

The Industrial Revolution and the development of a capitalist economy in Europe and the United States during the 18th and 19th centuries produced a labor class, and integrated them into its production system under poor working conditions. However, as the labor unions were organized to protect workers’ rights, their political influences expanded and it became more difficult for capitalist corporations and political elites to ignore their demands for better working conditions without sabotage or resistance that could damage the stability and efficiency of production for economic profit. As a result, “the new colonial theory transferred the reign of commercial privilege and extraordinary profit from the exploitation of the European working class to the exploitation of backward races under the political domination of Europe” (Du Bois 1915: 235).

White countries looked for cheap labor and natural resources for exploitation and colonized African and Asian nations as a result. However, their capitalistic motivation for economic profit and political ambition for territorial expansion were kept implicit in order to lessen the sense of guilt on the side of white people. These countries needed more reasonable justifications for the enslavement of colored people. According to racist ideology,

as previously discussed, colored people were regarded as “congenitally lazy” (Du Bois 1945: 25). Such a racist doctrine enabled white nations to explain the positive meaning of the enslavement of colored people in Asia and Africa, especially by arguing that “if they were not enslaved by Europeans, they would enslave each other” (1945: 25).

Colored people were also regarded as inherently “passive” and “docile” in racist discourse, allowing whites to argue that colored people were suitable for slave labor only under the control of white people, and further that they could be expected to work hard as people of a “docile industrial class” (Du Bois 1915: 237).

While concealing real motivations for economic exploitation and territorial expansion in paternalistic terms, white nations justified the colonization and enslavement of “inferior” races as their moral responsibilities or Christian missions as “heaven-sent rulers of yellow, brown, and black people” (Du Bois 1946: 17). They also claimed that white countries should colonize colored people and contribute to the development of their economy and civilization. As Du Bois explained their justification, white countries insisted that “the leaders of world civilization must control and guide the backward peoples for the good of all” (1945: 25). Whether in religious terms or through economic explanation, colonization was thought of as the “White Man’s Burden” (Du Bois 1946: 17) and “manifest destiny” (Du Bois 1945: 25), and was justified as beneficial for the colored people.

According to Edwards J. Blum, Du Bois harshly criticized white supremacist Christianity for its “distorting the original teachings of the Bible for their [whites] own self-serving purposes” and even “linked the sins of the white Christian world with those of Adolf Hitler’s Nazi Germany” (2007: 42, 122).

### 3.3. White Nations’ Aggression Toward Territorial Expansion

Racist ideology, strong motivation for capitalistic exploitation, and competition for colonial territories were interconnected and then prompted white powers to aggressively struggle for more economic profits and political ambitions. Namely, international conflicts cannot be explained without referring to these previously discussed factors. To explain the causes of World War I, Du Bois stated that “The World War was primarily the jealous and avaricious struggle for the largest share in exploiting darker races” (1920: 28). His understanding of war remained the same after World War II: “One modern institution is working desperately, and that is colonialism, and colonialism has been and is and ever will be one of the chief causes of war” (Du Bois 1952: 28).

However, the real motivations for militaristic aggressions were not explicit. As has often been the case, white countries, especially the United States, claimed that they fought war for the “Free World” (Du Bois 1946: 280). To take up one example, World War II was claimed to be “the War to End War” (Du Bois 1946: 12). Instead, Du Bois continued, “this war had not ended the idea of European world domination. Rather it had loosened the seams of imperialism” (1946: 16).

Du Bois never believed in “the War to End War,” and criticized the United States for its hypocritical justification for war in the early 20th century: “It is curious to see America, the United States, looking on herself, first, as a sort of natural peacemaker, then as a moral protagonist in this terrible time. No nation is less fitted for this role” (1920: 28). Du Bois undoubtedly regarded the Korean War and the Cold War as a result of American ambitions to dominate the world, politically and economically, despite its claim that it was fighting war to promote and widen the “Free World.”

#### 4. Du Bois's Global Activities for World Peace

As discussed above, Du Bois understood that racist ideology, capitalistic motivation to exploit cheap labor and natural resources, and colonial expansion led to international conflicts, such as two world wars, the Korean War, and the Cold War, further enforcing the structure of the white dominant world order. In this historical context, Du Bois warned of the possible outbreak of a “Third World War” (1952: 28).

Though Du Bois was a scholar, he was also a famous activist for Pan-African movement and world peace. He was often invited to attend and organized international conferences to advocate for anti-racism, decolonization, self-determination of colored nations, and world peace. Further, Du Bois cooperated closely with peace activists and groups in other countries, including the communist bloc.

In March, 1949, the National Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions organized the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City with the help of Du Bois and the Communist Party USA. The conference was attended by many influential figures of the arts, culture, and sciences from all over the world including communist countries, such as Russian musician Dmitri Shostakovich and writer Alexander Fedeyev. However, “The U.S. State Department admitted a handful of ‘official’ delegates from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe but denied visas to most ‘individual’ delegates from Latin America and Western Europe, seeking, it seemed to some observers, to overemphasize Eastern bloc influence on the proceedings” (Porter 2010: 150). In fact, the U.S. government did not issue visas to Pablo Picasso and other influential figures from Western Europe. The U.S. government successfully labeled the conference as “communist,” stirring negative and emotional reactions from the press.

In March, 1950, Du Bois himself established the Peace Information Center and became its chairperson with the purpose of “informing the Americans how people all over the world are thinking about war and what they are doing for the world peace” (Du Bois 1952: 35). One of the most important missions of the Peace Information Center was to distribute the Stockholm Peace Appeal for signatures in the United States. Du Bois claimed that 2,500,000 signed the petition (1952: 36).

The Stockholm Peace Appeal was adopted at a meeting of the World Defenders of

Peace in Sweden on March 15, 1950, attended by 150 people from 18 countries including the United States and the Soviet Union. The Stockholm Peace Appeal occurred in response to two atomic bombs that killed many innocent civilians in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan, on August 6 and 9, 1945. Immediately after the bombings, the United States and the Soviet Union began to rapidly escalate their competition for the development of weapons of mass destruction just prior to the Korean War. The petition in the Stockholm Peace Appeal reads as follows:

“We demand the absolute banning of the atomic weapon, and arm of terror and of mass extermination of populations. We demand the establishment of strict international control to ensure the implementation of this ban. We consider that the first government henceforth to use the atomic weapon against any country whatsoever will be committing a crime against humanity and should be treated as a war criminal. We call on all people of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal.” (Du Bois 1952: 37)

The Stockholm Peace Appeal, with “the desire to prevent modern culture from relapsing into primitive barbarism,” circulated throughout the world, and millions of people signed the petition, including internationally famous and influential figures such as George Bernard Shaw, Thomas Mann, and Emily Greene Balch (Du Bois 1952: 37-38).

## 5. The Intimidation Against Du Bois and the Peace Information Center

However, because the United States possessed the most powerful nuclear capabilities at the time, the Stockholm Peace Appeal “was looked upon as un-American” (Neyland 1992: 10). In fact, “Stalin himself viewed the peace movement [in Western Europe and the United States] in the late 1940s as an important check on Western anti-Soviet aggression and resolve,” and the “Soviet Union had much to gain geopolitically by portraying itself as committed to peace and the United States as an imperialist aggressor,” although the Soviet Union had already succeeded in its atomic weapons testing in August 1949 (Porter 2010: 150).

In this historical context of the Cold War, the U.S. government and FBI suspected close connections between Du Bois and communist networks both in the United States and foreign countries. He was often negatively referred to as a “communist” in congressional hearings. Louisiana District Attorney Leander H. Perez, in a hearing at the Senate Judiciary Committee on July 13, 1956, stated that “The only Negro member of this group of organizers was W.E.B. Du Bois, who has long Communist, Communist-front, and subversive connections, according to the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities” (Senate 1956: 332).

The U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson condemned Du Bois for his “un-American”

activities on July 12, 1950, just after the Korean War broke out. According to an article published July 13 in the *New York Times*, Acheson said that the aims of the Stockholm Peace Appeal were to help the national interests of the Soviet Union, not to promote world peace as it claimed. Insisting that the Peace Information Center was a communist organization, Acheson and the State Department demanded that Du Bois cease distributing the Stockholm Peace Appeal to gain signatures and proposed that the Peace Information Center should be registered as a foreign agent.

On July 14, 1950, Du Bois publicly replied to Acheson's condemnation and asked, "Is it our strategy that when the Soviet Union asks for peace, we insist on war?" (Du Bois 1952: 39). Du Bois then went on to criticize Acheson and Americans in general, stating that "Today in this country it is becoming standard reaction to call anything 'communist' and therefore subversive and unpatriotic, which anybody for any reason dislikes" (1952: 39).

While the U.S. government regarded Du Bois and other members of the Peace Information Center as foreign agents, he denied the allegation, stating that "we in demanding peace were opposing Big Business which wanted war," and "we did this as free Americans and not as tools of any foreign or domestic power" (Du Bois 1952: 83).

However, Du Bois was prosecuted on February 9, 1951, because he failed to register the Peace Information Center as a foreign agent in accordance with the Foreign Agent Registration Act of 1938, despite the fact that the U.S. government warned him several times before the prosecution. Manning Marable specifically pointed out that "Du Bois was arrested for 'subversive' activities in 1951, his passport was revoked for years, and his books were widely removed from libraries" (1999: viii). Du Bois was later released on bail and had to immediately begin preparing for a court battle to prove his innocence.

## 6. Global Support for Du Bois's Political Activities

When Du Bois was indicted, domestic and international protests rose against the U.S. government. For instance, students' defense committees among various U.S. universities reacted, including the University of Chicago, Wilberforce University<sup>7</sup>, the University of Texas, and Fisk University<sup>8</sup>, though these movements were suppressed by the college authorities (Du Bois 1952: 106). The unions also supported Du Bois. Although he had been skeptical of the unions because African American workers had been excluded from the membership for a long period (Du Bois 1920: 53; see also Lewis 2000), "I began to grow sure that in the United States it is the independent trade union on which we must depend for far-sighted leadership and courageous thought and democratic control" (Du Bois 1952: 106).

Many organizations throughout the world were indignant toward the prosecution and stood up for Du Bois. National peace committees in seventy-eight countries, the Defenders of Peace in Paris, the World Federation of Scientific Workers, the International



Democratic Federation of Women, the International Union of Students, and many others condemned the U.S. government for the indictment of Du Bois (Du Bois 1952: 82).

As Du Bois pointed out, “both he [Judge James McGuire] and the Department of State realized that the eyes of the world were fixed on this case” (1952: 122). The U.S. government was seemingly sensitive to the international attention and protests against the prosecution until Du Bois was finally acquitted on November 13, 1951. According to Du Bois, “American Negroes are reaping benefits not due entirely to more liberal attitudes on the part of the white population, but rather to increasing sensitiveness of the United States to world criticism of its democracy” (Du Bois 1952: 178).

Despite the acquittal, however, Du Bois was continually intimidated by the U.S. government. He tried to travel abroad and attend international conferences for world peace and applied for a visa and passport after the acquittal, but because he refused to sign a loyalty oath and to state that he had never been a member of the Communist Party, his applications were repeatedly denied.

However, after the Supreme Court issued a decision that the State Department could not demand a loyalty oath for a passport, Du Bois successfully applied for a passport in 1958. Soon after, he traveled to meet Nikita Khrushchev in the Soviet Union in 1958, and then moved to China to see Mao Zedong in 1959. In 1960, Du Bois went to Ghana where his old friend Kwame Nkrumah became the first prime minister after the country's independence in 1957. While Du Bois was in Ghana, he applied for the renewal of his passport in 1963, but the U.S. government denied his application because of his political activities in the past, and above all due to the fact that he had joined the American Communist Party in 1961. Du Bois was too old to withstand the political pressures and to struggle for world peace in his later years. He stayed in Ghana until he died in 1963, just three days before the March on Washington on August 28.

## 7. Conclusion: The Paradox of American Democracy

After reviewing Du Bois's unsuccessful struggle for world peace and his political hardship during the Cold War, can we then conclude that his political activities did not achieve any democratic progress, domestic or international? Though Du Bois failed to stop American militaristic policies, he successfully revealed the paradoxical dynamics of American democracy in the global context. Further, he may have contributed to the racial justice in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s.

Du Bois recognized that coalitions with other groups, domestic or international, are important to promote the cause of democracy. He further expected that the international pressures would work well because the U.S. government could not ignore its international image in the changing geopolitical landscape during the Cold War, and further because it had to carefully listen to the voices of all global citizens, including colonized people. Mary

Dudziak (2000), Azza Salama Layton (2000), and others point out that it is impossible to understand the dynamic processes of democratization in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s without taking into consideration the global factors such as internationally rising protests against racism and colonialism. In the historical context of the Cold War, “The federal government and political leaders were keenly aware that the national interests of the superpower paradoxically depended on cooperation of other countries, including small nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America” (Honda 2009: 191). Actually, Du Bois tried his best to strategically mobilize the international protests against the hypocrisy of American democracy, and to deepen its legitimacy crisis. Defeating fascism in World War II and fighting the Soviet Union for democracy, the United States was significantly forced to prove that it was doing its best to achieve its democratic ideals. Finally, with the increase of local, national, and global pressures for democratization, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Dudziak 2000; Layton 2000; Honda 2005).

This historical example of Du Bois’s fight for racial justice does not prove that his battle for world peace went on as he had anticipated. However, we can conclude that his domestic and international activities for world peace effectively exposed the negative side of American democracy and succeeded in mobilizing the global pressures against the U.S. government. This led to a political shift that forced the U.S. government to prove on its own that it was more committed to democracy and world peace than the Soviet Union.

However, the United States has not learned from its self-defeating history of warmongering hysteria, as evidenced by the fact that it stubbornly ignored international warnings and protests against American wars in Afghanistan just after the terrorist attacks in 2001 and in Iraq in 2003, both of which involved the killing of many innocent people. Nevertheless, it is also true that the United States remains the most influential superpower in international politics, without which the world order would be destabilized and chaotic. Only if U.S. citizens as well as the international community maintain a watchful eye on the U.S. government will they be capable of possibly deterring the United States from getting out of control. Through shared monitoring of the U.S. government’s activities, it may be held accountable especially as the United States consistently hopes to avoid a legitimacy crisis and to keep its hegemonic global dominance intact. The history of W.E.B. Du Bois’s struggle can still instruct the international community and American citizens on the paradox of American democracy in the 21st century.

## Notes

- 1 Eric Porter mentions some similarities between Du Bois’s perspective and Emanuel Wallerstein’s world system theory, stating that Du Bois “examined mechanisms put in place at the beginning of the cycle Wallerstein identifies, which continue to structure racial hierarchies and the meaning of race on a global scale. World War II brought home the historical links between war,

imperialism, and race” (2010: 98).

- 2 Du Bois became a member of the Communist Party in 1961 before leaving the United States for Ghana. In 1963, his passport expired and he applied for renewal, but the U.S. Embassy in Accra rejected his application because he was communist, resulting in his loss of U.S. citizenship. He died in Ghana in 1963.
- 3 Norio Chiba is the first Japanese scholar to publish a book concerning Du Bois (2003), and deserves special attention from those who are interested in Du Bois’s academic works and political activities against the negative aspects of American Democracy.
- 4 Du Bois wrote in his 1952 memoir *In Battle for Peace* that he became more Marxist after World War I and supported Robert M. La Follette of the Progressive Party in the 1924 presidential election (1952: 45). Appealing for democratic reforms and criticizing politics controlled by business interests, the Progressive Party cooperated with the NAACP that Du Bois had played an important role in founding in 1909.
- 5 Du Bois praised Stalin despite his atrocious policies, even though Du Bois must have known that the genocide took place under the Stalin regime during the 1930s and 1940s after Nikita Khrushchev’s “secret speech” condemning the grave human rights abuses in February 1956. Du Bois sent a letter to Graves Ann Melissa on July 8, 1956, stating that “I still regard Stalin as one of the greatest men of the twentieth century. He was not perfect; he was probably too cruel; but he did three things: he established the first socialist state in the modern world; he broke the power of the kulaks; and he conquered Hitler” (1978: 402). Du Bois did not believe the U.S. news reports of Khrushchev’s speech because American media had long distorted information concerning domestic and international matters in favor of white interests (Blum 2007: 195).
- 6 According to Lawrence A. Scaff, Max Weber shared Du Bois’s concerns about global racial problems, and sent a sympathetic letter from New York City while he was travelling in the United States to Du Bois on November 17, 1904. In this letter, Weber stated, “I am absolutely convinced that the ‘colour-line’ problem will be the paramount problem of the time to come, here and everywhere in the world” (Scaff 2011: 100). They had known each other since Du Bois studied in Berlin from 1892 to 1894, and had a chance to meet when Weber attended the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1904 (see also Honda 2015: 38).
- 7 In 1894, Du Bois started teaching Latin, Greece, and German at Wilberforce University, Ohio. He moved from Wilberforce to Pennsylvania University in 1896.
- 8 Du Bois was an alumnus of Fisk University, Tennessee, an African American institution. He studied there from 1885 to 1888 and then at Harvard University thereafter until his graduation in 1890.

## References

- Blum, Edward J., 2007, *W.E.B. Du Bois: American Prophet*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Chiba, Norio, 2003, *W.E.B. Du Bois: Jinshu Byodo Kakutoku no tameno Tatakai* (*W.E.B. Du Bois: His*

- Battle for Racial Equality*), Tokyo: Kindai Bungeisha.
- Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt, 1899=1996, *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- , 1903, *The Souls of Black Folk*, New Jersey: Bantam Books.
- , 1915, *The Negro*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- , 1920, *Darkwater: Voices from within the Veil*, New York: Dover.
- , 1945, *Color and Democracy: Colonies and Peace*, New York: Kraus-Thomson.
- , 1946, *The World and Africa*, New York: International Publishers.
- , 1952, *In Battle for Peace*, New York: Masses and Mainstream.
- , 1978, *The Correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois: Volume III, Selections, 1944-1963*, Herbert Aptheker (ed.), Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Dudziak, Mary L., 2000, *Cold War Civil Rights*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Honda, Kazuhisa, 2005, “America Minshushugi” wo Tou (*Rethinking American Democracy: Racism and Deliberative Democracy*), Tokyo: Yuigaku Shobo.
- , 2009, “Postwar Civil Rights Politics in the United States: Understanding the Dynamics of Democratization from a Global Perspective,” *Nanzan Review of American Studies* 31: 179-193.
- , 2015, “Max Weber and W.E.B. Du Bois on Color Line,” *The Annual Review of Sociology* (The Kanto Sociological Society) 28: 35-39.
- Layton, Azza Salama, 2000, *International Politics and Civil Rights Policies in the United States, 1941-1960*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, David Levering, 2000, *W.E.B. Du Bois*, New York: Henry Holt.
- Marable, Manning, 1999, “Introduction,” in Du Bois, *Darkwater*, New York: Dover.
- Neyland, James, 1992, *W.E.B. Du Bois*, California: Melrose Square.
- Parsons, Talcott, 1977, *The Evolution of Societies*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Porter, Eric, 2010, *The Problem of the Future World: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Race Concept at Midcentury*, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Scaff, Lawrence A., 2011, *Max Weber in America*, New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Takagi, Kazuyoshi, 1988, *Gendai America Shakai to Parsons (Contemporary America and Parsons)*, Tokyo: Nippon Hyoron Sha.
- U.S. Senate Hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, 1956, *Civil Rights Proposal*, U.S. Government Printing Office.